

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 4, 2004, the Examiner noted that claims 1-23 were pending, objected to claims 8, 10-12, and 19-21 and rejected claims 1-7, 9, 13-18, 22 and 23. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 15-21 and 23 have been amended, new claim 24 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-24 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 8, 10-12 and 19-21 and indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. These claims have been so rewritten and it is submitted that these claims have not been narrowed and have the same scope as prior to being made independent and are now allowable. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Meng. Page 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7, 13, 16 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Meng. Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Meng and Acampora. Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 9 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Meng and Kazui.

Meng discusses a system that processes forward and backward motion vectors to determine ratios, detects peaks in the ratios and detects a parabolic variance cure to detect a scene change after which the bit stream is fully decoded.

In contrast, the present invention (see claims 1, 15, 23 and 24 - new) detects a scene change by comparing a function evaluation result with a threshold where the function evaluation result is calculated "only for a frame within a frame group which satisfies a condition that a forward prediction motion vector and a backward prediction motion vector in consecutive frames are small". The prior art does not teach or suggest such a conditional calculation as a part of scene change detection.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 2 calls for using a scene interval as part of the scene change information including the result of the evaluation-

comparison.. The prior art does not teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.


It is submitted that claims 8, 10-12 and 19-21 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3/3/15

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501